ICANN | GNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP
September 2017 Newsletter

**Note: all upcoming meetings are subject to change. For current scheduling information, please see the GNSO Master Calendar, Working Group scheduling document, and list of upcoming Work Track topics.

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

Overall Working Group

Current Status:

The Working Group (WG) is continuing to refine preliminary outcomes for the overarching subjects in the WG's Charter, leveraging input received through Community Comment 1 (CC1). Three streams of work are currently underway, each with a specific focus: different TLD types, predictability/community engagement, and "rounds" for application assessment.

Geographic names at the top level is one of the many subjects included in the PDP Charter and a topic that has broad community interest. The co-chairs are in the process of developing a fifth Work Track in the PDP devoted solely to this issue, using a shared leadership model between the GAC, ALAC, ccNSO, and GNSO. The co-chairs have asked the GAC, ALAC, ccNSO, and GNSO to each identify a co-leader for this effort and seek to initiate work once the co-leads have been put forward. We hope to initiate a call for general membership in the group towards the end of September.

The Work Tracks are currently working through the issues identified in Community Comment 2 (CC2).

Next Steps:

The full Working Group will continue to refine documentation reflecting deliberations on the overarching issues, taking into account input from a number of sources. The Work Tracks will maintain focus on reviewing and incorporating feedback received through Community Comment 2 (CC2).

Work Track 1

Current Status:

In August, the WT focused on Application Fees, Variable Fees, and Systems. A full record of deliberations is available in the WT1 working document.

8 August meeting highlights:
- Reviewed CC2 comments on Application Fees, including feedback about the possibility of having upper and lower limits to the fee, as well as potential strategies for managing fee surplus or shortfall.
- While WT members and CC2 responses generally supported the concept of cost recovery, the group agreed that it is important to have a clear, common understanding of the definition of this term, including the relationship between cost recovery and a possible fee "floor" or "ceiling."

22 August meeting highlights:
- Reviewed CC2 comments on the topic of Systems. CC2 comments put forward a number of suggestions for improving systems in subsequent procedures. Many responses supported the idea that ICANN should be able to provide applicants with invoices.
- Deliberated on CC2 comments covering Variable Fees, and in particular whether it is appropriate to have different fees for different application types. Some Work Track members noted that it may be useful to first agree on public policy principles and then develop a strategy on fee structure that supports those principles.

WT1 had a WT3 had a meeting on 5 September, which covered CC2 comments on Communications and Applicant Support. The discussion will be summarized in the following edition of the newsletter.

Next Steps:

WT1 has a meeting scheduled for 19 September (topic: review of CC2 comments on Communications and Registry Service Provider Accreditation Programs).

Work Track 2

Current Status:

In August, the WT focused on Reserved Names and Registrant Protections. A full record of deliberations is available in the WT2 working document.

10 August meeting highlights:
- Reviewed CC2 comments on Reserved Names, including suggested adjustments to string requirements at the top level and reserved names at the top level, as well as feedback on provisions of the Registry Agreement that allow the Registry Operator to reserve an unlimited amount of domain names, and use up to 100 names at the second level for operational and promotional purposes.
- There was general agreement among CC2 comments and Work Track members that Special Use Domain Names as identified through the IETF processes should be included in the list of reserved names at the top level in the AGB.

[24 August](#) meeting highlights:
- Began reviewing [CC2 comments](#) on [Registrant Protections](#), including suggestions for improvement to the system of registrant protections and feedback on whether some TLDs should be exempt from these requirements.
- Agreed that it would be helpful to research alternative methods of funding for the Emergency Back-end Registry Operator (EBERO) program, as concerns have been raised about the Continued Operations Instrument.
- Discussed ideas for giving ICANN more flexibility to determine appropriate measures to take when emergency thresholds are reached and whether or not to initiate the EBERO process. The WT reviewed a proposal for cases where a Registry Operator (RO) becomes financially incapable of managing the TLD. It suggests that the RSP assumes contractual responsibilities for managing the TLD instead of the TLD migrating to a new RSP and RO. WT members agreed that this would be a more efficient measure to protect registrants and noted that the RSP must be subject to the evaluations required to manage a TLD as an RO.

Next Steps:

WT2 has meetings scheduled for 7 September (topic: continued review of [CC2 comments](#) on [Registrant Protections](#)), 14 September (topic: [Closed Generics](#)), 21 September (topic: [Closed Generics](#)) and 28 September (topic: Terms and Conditions).

Work Track 3

Current Status:

In August, the WT focused on [Objections](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT3 [working document](#).

[1 August](#) meeting highlights:
- Continued to review [CC2 comments](#) on [Objections](#), including feedback on instances of "gaming," the role of the Independent Objector, and the idea of allowing parties to disputes to choose between 1- and 3- member panels.
- Agreed to look more closely at issues related to the Independent Objector after some Work Track members raised concerns about the IO's scope of activity and performance in the 2012 round.
- WT members were generally supportive of the suggestion to have an initial review of standing before each type of objections process proceeds.

[15 August](#) meeting highlights:
- Continued discussion on the Independent Objector, reviewing the [report](#) the IO produced containing a series of recommendations following the 2012 round.
- Received additional clarification on comments from the RySG recommending that Community Applicants should not be allowed to participate in Community Priority Evaluation and also be allowed to file a Community Objection against another applicant for the same string.

[29 August](#) meeting highlights:
- Further discussed the role of the Independent Objector, including budget, success rate, and possible alternative models to the single, standing IO used in the 2012 round.
- Continued to discuss [CC2 comments](#) on [Objections](#), with a focus on the proposal to allow parties to disputes to choose between 1- and 3- member panels.

Next Steps:

WT3 has a meeting scheduled for 12 September (topic: review [CC2 comments](#) on [String Similarity](#)), and 26 September (topic: review [CC2 comments](#) on [Applicant Freedom of Expression](#) & [Accountability Mechanisms](#)).

Work Track 4

Current Status:

In August, the WT focused on [Applicant Reviews](#) and discussion of [CC2 comments](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT4 [working document](#).

[3 August](#) meeting highlights:
- Reviewed suggested language for a proposed policy recommendation on Universal Acceptance.
- Discussed topics that will be covered in upcoming meetings, with a focus on any additional input or background information the Work Track may need to support deliberations.

[17 August](#) meeting highlights:
- Reviewed status of discussions on Application Evaluation, introducing [feedback](#) received from ICANN Technical Services to simplify the scoring framework.
- Discussed a strawman on registry services proposing that registry services would not be specified in the application process. New registry services could be made available through the Registry Services Evaluation Program starting at contracting time.

[31 August](#) meeting highlights:
- Continued to discuss and consider revisions to the strawman on registry services. At the conclusion of the call the strawman included the following language: "Applicants will be allowed but not required to specify additional registry services. List of previously approved registry services (IDN Languages, GPML, BTAPPA) to be included by reference in AGB and contract. If applicant informs additional registry services, applicant will specify whether it wants it evaluated through RSEP at evaluation time, contracting time or after contract signing, acknowledging that exception processing in evaluation or contracting could incur additional application fees. If applicant has not informed additional registry services, RSEP will only be available after contract signing."
- Began to discuss a strawman regarding application question 30 on security policies: "Keep question 30a (summary of security policy almost as it is, clarifying that it only applies to provision of registry services and make its scoring 0-1 not 0-1-2. Remove

question 30b (full security policy)." There were no objections or suggested changes on the strawman.

Next Steps:

WT4 has meetings scheduled for 14 September (topics: Financial Evaluation, Clarifying Questions) and 28 September (topics: to be determined).

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

In June 2014, the GNSO Council established a Discussion Group that was intended to evaluate the experiences of the 2012 round gTLD Program and to identify possible areas for future GNSO policy development. The Discussion Group's deliverables served as the basis for the GNSO Council's request for a Preliminary Issue Report in June of 2015.

Following the publication of the Final Issue Report, the GNSO Council adopted the charter for the PDP Working Group, which began its work in February 2016. The Working Group initially concentrated on a set of overarching issues, and has since established four separate Work Tracks to consider specific topic areas: Work Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach, Work Track 2 - Legal/Regulatory, Work Track 3: String Contention/Objections & Disputes, Work Track 4: Internationalized Domain Names/Technical & Operations.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The Discussion Group identified a number of subjects that may require further analysis and possible formulation of policy language. There are existing policy recommendations adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board, which will remain in place unless the PDP WG determines that changes are needed.

To join this effort, please email the GNSO Secretariat: gnso-secs@icann.org
All are welcome!

MORE INFORMATION
- PDP Working Group Workspace Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/RgV1Aw
- PDP Working Group Charter: https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw
- PDP Working Group Active Project Page: https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures